

1 Mildred K. O'Linn (State Bar No. 159055)  
2 *missy.olinn@manningkass.com*  
3 Lynn L. Carpenter (State Bar No. 310011)  
4 *lynn.carpenter@manningkass.com*  
5 Maya R. Sorensen (State Bar No. 250722)  
6 *maya.sorensen@manningkass.com*  
7 **MANNING & KASS**  
8 **ELLROD, RAMIREZ, TRESTER LLP**  
9 801 S. Figueroa St, 15<sup>th</sup> Floor  
10 Los Angeles, California 90017-3012  
11 Telephone: (213) 624-6900  
12 Facsimile: (213) 624-6999

13  
14 Attorneys for Defendants, CITY OF  
15 FRESNO, UNKNOWN LAW  
16 ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS, and  
17 FORMER POLICE CHIEF PACO  
18 BALDERRAMA

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

19 MARTHA ZEPEDA OLIVARES,  
20 individually and on behalf of the  
21 ESTATE OF MAXIMILIANO SOSA,  
22 JR.; MAXIMILIANO SOSA, SR,

23 Plaintiffs,

24 v.

25 CITY OF FRESNO; UNKNOWN  
26 LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS,  
27 POLICE CHIEF PACO  
28 BALDERRAMA and DOES 1-30,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:23-cv-01575-JLT-SAB  
Dist. Court Judge Jennifer L. Thurston  
Magistrate Judge Barbara A. McAuliffe

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND  
MOTION BY DEFENDANTS TO  
DISMISS PORTIONS OF  
PLAINTIFF'S FIRST AMENDED  
COMPLAINT**

[*Filed concurrently with Proposed  
Order*]

Hearing Date: October 11, 2024  
Time: 9:00 a.m.  
Courtroom: 4

Action Filed: 02/23/2024  
Trial Date: Not Yet Set

///

///

///

1 **TO PLAINTIFF AND HIS ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

2 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that at 9:00 a.m., on October 11, 2024, in Courtroom  
3 4 (7<sup>th</sup> Floor), located at the United States District Court, Eastern District of California,  
4 2500 Tulare Street, Fresno, California 93721; pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil  
5 Procedure 7, 11, and 12, and United States District Court, Eastern District of  
6 California Local Rule 230, as well as the applicable Orders of the Court; Defendants  
7 CITY OF FRESNO, UNKNOWN LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS, and  
8 FORMER POLICE CHIEF PACO BALDERRAMA (collectively “defendants”),  
9 will move this Court for an Order dismissing, without leave to amend, a portion of  
10 plaintiffs’ First Amended Complaint (FAC), which was filed on February 23, 2024  
11 [Doc. 26] as follows:

12 1. Plaintiffs’ Fifth claim for violation of the Americans with Disabilities  
13 Act and Rehabilitation Act (“ADA”) in its entirety, for failure to state a claim upon  
14 which relief can be granted;

15 2. In the alternative, defendants hereby request that this Honorable Court  
16 dismiss plaintiffs’ fifth cause of action claims with leave to amend.

17 This motion is made on the grounds that plaintiffs fail to state a valid ADA  
18 claim.

19 This motion is made pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), and  
20 is based upon this notice of motion and the attached memorandum of points and  
21 authorities filed and served herewith, the proposed order lodged and served  
22 concurrently, the papers and records on file in this action, and upon such additional  
23 evidence and arguments as may be properly before this Court at the time of the hearing  
24 on this motion.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **NOTICE ON CONFERENCE OF COUNSEL PER LOCAL RULE.**

2 This motion is made after the defendants attempted resolution by conference of  
3 counsel as required by this Court's standing orders [Doc. 5-1]. Prior to filing this  
4 motion, defendants' counsel provided plaintiffs' counsel with a detailed meet and  
5 confer letter first on March 4, 2024, setting forth defendants' position as to plaintiffs'  
6 lack of standing to file the FAC. On March 5, 2024, the parties agreed to stipulate to  
7 a postponement of the scheduling conference and defendants' response date to allow  
8 time for decedent's wife and children to enter the case. The responsive pleading date  
9 was then continued by this Court to September 6, 2024. [Doc. 34.]

10 In anticipation of defendants' responsive pleading due date, defendants reached  
11 out to plaintiffs on August 19, 2024 to discuss the fact that the real successors in  
12 interest were not, on that date, in the case. The rightful heirs had not filed a complaint  
13 yet. Defendants also raised concerns about plaintiffs' ADA claim. Plaintiffs did not  
14 respond. On August 26, 2024, defendants sent meet and confer correspondence setting  
15 forth defendants' position as to the issues and deficiencies with regard to plaintiffs'  
16 ADA claim. On September 3, 2024, defendants reached out to plaintiffs via phone  
17 and email to further discuss the instant motion to dismiss. As of the filing of this  
18 motion, plaintiffs have not responded to defendants' numerous requests to meet and  
19 confer.

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 DATED: September 6, 2024

**MANNING & KASS  
ELLROD, RAMIREZ, TRESTER LLP**

3 By: /s/ Mildred K. O'Linn

4 Mildred K. O'Linn, Esq.

5 Lynn L. Carpenter, Esq.

6 Maya R. Sorensen, Esq.

7 Attorneys for Defendants, CITY OF  
8 FRESNO; UNKNOWN LAW  
9 ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS, and  
10 POLICE CHIEF PACO BALDERRAMA

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

MANNING & KASS  
ELLROD, RAMIREZ, TRESTER LLP  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

## **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

## I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint ("FAC") alleges that on November 3, 2023, Defendants City of Fresno ("CITY"), Unknown Law Enforcement Officers and [Former] Police Chief Paco Balderrama ("Chief Balderrama") (collectively "Defendants") violated various rights under federal law in connection with the alleged use of excessive force against decedent, Maximiliano Sosa ("decedent").

However, plaintiffs' fifth cause of action for violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act and Rehabilitation Act ("ADA") fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. Accordingly, defendants request that the Court dismiss the fifth cause of action for failing to state a claim.

## II. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

Plaintiffs' fifth cause of action under the ADA fails to state a claim because plaintiffs neither allege that decedent had a "specific, recognized, mental or physical illness" nor that he had any record of such impairment. Moreover, plaintiffs' FAC neither alleges that the officers' used force on decedent *because* of his alleged disability, nor does the complaint allege that the officers even knew of any alleged disability. The Court should therefore grant defendants' motion to dismiss plaintiffs' ADA claim.

### III. STANDARD FOR MOTION TO DISMISS

Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), a claim may be dismissed because of the plaintiff's "failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted." Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). A dismissal under Rule 12(b)(6) may be based on the lack of a cognizable legal theory or on the absence of sufficient facts alleged under a cognizable legal theory. *Johnson v. Riverside Healthcare Sys.*, 534 F.3d 1116, 1121 (9th Cir. 2008); *Navarro v. Block*, 250 F.3d 729, 732 (9th Cir. 2001).

In reviewing a complaint under Rule 12(b)(6), all allegations of material fact are taken as true and construed in the light most favorable to the non-moving party.

1 *Marceau v. Blackfeet Hous. Auth.*, 540 F.3d 916, 919 (9th Cir. 2008); *Vignolo v.*  
 2 *Miller*, 120 F.3d 1075, 1077 (9th Cir. 1999). But the Court is *not* required “to accept  
 3 as true allegations that are merely conclusory, unwarranted deductions of fact, or  
 4 unreasonable inferences.” *In re Gilead Scic. Sec. Litig.*, 536 F.3d 1049, 1056-1057  
 5 (9th Cir. 2008); *Sprewell v. Golden State Warriors*, 266 F.3d 979, 988 (9th Cir. 2001).  
 6 As the Supreme Court has explained:

7       While a complaint attacked by a Rule 12(b)(6) motion to  
 8 dismiss does not need detailed factual allegations, a  
 9 plaintiff's obligation to provide the 'grounds' of his  
 10 entitlement to relief requires more than labels and  
 11 conclusions, and a formulaic recitation of the elements of a  
 cause of action will not do. Factual allegations must be  
 enough to raise a right to relief *above the speculative level*,  
 on the assumption that all the allegations in the complaint  
 are true (even if doubtful in fact).

12 *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 555 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (emphasis added). Thus,  
 13 to avoid a Rule 12(b)(6) dismissal, “a complaint must contain sufficient factual  
 14 matter, accepted as true, to ‘state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’  
 15 [Citation.]” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009). “A claim has facial  
 16 plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the  
 17 reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.  
 18 [Citation.]” *Id.* “The plausibility standard is not akin to a ‘probability requirement,’  
 19 but it asks for more than a sheer possibility that a defendant has acted unlawfully.”  
 20 *Id.* “[W]here the well pleaded facts do not permit the court to infer more than the  
 21 mere possibility of misconduct, the complaint has alleged, but it has not ‘show[n],’  
 22 ‘that the pleader is entitled to relief.’ [Citation.]” *Id.* at 679.

23       If the court finds that a complaint should be dismissed for failure to state a  
 24 claim, the Court has discretion to dismiss the complaint with *or* without leave to  
 25 amend. *See, e.g., Lopez v. Smith*, 203 F.3d 1122, 1126-31 (9th Cir. 2000); *accord*  
 26 *Machul v. City of Long Beach*, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 52472, \*6 (C.D. Cal. February  
 27 20, 2015). Leave to amend should be granted if it appears plausible that the defects  
 28 in the complaint could be corrected. Thus, if a Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss is

1 granted, “[the] district court should grant leave to amend even if no request to amend  
 2 the pleading was made, unless it determines that the pleading could not possibly be  
 3 cured by the allegation of other facts.” *Doe v. United States*, 58 F.3d 494, 497 (9th  
 4 Cir. 1995). However, if after careful review it becomes clear that a complaint cannot  
 5 be cured by amendment, the court may dismiss the complaint without leave to amend.  
 6 See *Chaset v. Fleer/Skybox Int'l*, 300 F.3d 1083, 1087-1088 (9th Cir. 2002); *Machul*,  
 7 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 52472 at \*6. In other words, ***leave to amend need not be***  
 8 ***granted when amendment would be futile.*** *Gompper v. VISX, Inc.*, 298 F.3d 893,  
 9 898 (9th Cir. 2002) (emphasis added).

10 Here, plaintiffs have not shown a willingness to amend the complaint and there  
 11 is no evidence that amending the complaint could cure the deficiencies. Accordingly,  
 12 defendants request that the referenced portions of plaintiffs’ FAC be dismissed  
 13 without leave to amend.

14 **IV. PLAINTIFFS’ FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION FOR VIOLATING THE**  
**AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT AND THE**  
**REHABILITATION ACT FAILS TO STATE A CLAIM UPON**  
**WHICH RELIEF CAN BE GRANTED.**

15 Plaintiffs allege that the City of Fresno denied Maximiliano Sosa the benefits  
 16 of Title II ADA services, programs, and/or activities and subjected Mr. Sosa to  
 17 unlawful discrimination by failing to provide reasonable accommodations for his  
 18 disabilities. However, plaintiffs’ Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief  
 19 can be granted.

20 In order to state a claim under Title II of the ADA, a plaintiff must prove that:  
 21 (1) he or she is an individual with a disability; (2) he or she is otherwise qualified to  
 22 participate in or receive the benefit of a public entity’s services, programs or  
 23 activities; (3) that he or she was either excluded from participation in or denied the  
 24 benefits of some public entity’s services, programs or activities, or was otherwise  
 25 discriminated against by a public entity; and (4) the exclusion, denial of benefits or

1 discrimination was by reason of the plaintiff's disability. *O'Guinn v. Lovelock*  
 2 *Corr. Ctr.*, 502 F.3d 1056, 1060 (9th Cir. 2007).

3 According to the ADA, an individual is disabled if that individual "(1) has a  
 4 physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more of the  
 5 individual's major life activities; (2) has a record of such an impairment; or (3) is  
 6 regarded as having such an impairment." *Deppe v. United States*, 217 F.3d 1262,  
 7 1265 (9th Cir. 2000). The courts require that plaintiff allege "that [the Decedent]  
 8 suffered from a specific, recognized, mental or physical illness." *Bresaz v. Cnty. of*  
 9 *Santa Clara*, 136 F. Supp. 3d. 1125, 1136 (N.D. Cal. 2015).

10 Here, the complaint merely asserts that "Max had developed emotional  
 11 distress and was having a mental health episode that resulted in his being disabled  
 12 for the purposes of federal and state law." This does not allege a "specific,  
 13 recognized, mental or physical illness," but instead vaguely states that Mr. Sosa had  
 14 emotional distress with a reference to one mental health episode at an unspecified  
 15 time. Moreover, the complaint fails to allege that Mr. Sosa had any record of such  
 16 impairment or that anyone regarded him as having such an impairment.

17 Element three of Title II discrimination requires plaintiffs to plead facts that  
 18 plausibly indicate that the discrimination was "by reason of his disability." 42  
 19 U.S.C. § 12132. Plaintiffs' complaint does not allege that the officers' used force on  
 20 Mr. Sosa because he was disabled, or that the officers knew of his alleged mental  
 21 illness. "To find that a refusal to reasonably accommodate a person with a  
 22 qualifying disability was 'by reason of' the disability, plaintiff needs to plead that  
 23 his known disability was a motivating factor in the non-accommodation of his  
 24 arrest, or that the deputies knew of and were motivated by his investigation with  
 25 ADA compliance." See *Avila v. City of Visalia*, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 115935,  
 26 2010 WL 4483393, at 3 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 1, 2010). Here, plaintiffs have pled no facts  
 27 to suggest that the officers knew that Mr. Sosa had a mental illness, let alone that it  
 28 was a "motivating factor" in the officers' use of force. For this reason, plaintiffs'

1 cause of action for violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act and the  
2 Rehabilitation Act should be dismissed for failure to state a viable claim.

3 **V. CONCLUSION**

4 For all of the foregoing reasons, the honorable Court should GRANT the instant  
5 motion and dismiss Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint without leave to amend. In  
6 the alternative, the Court should dismiss claims to the fullest extent the Court deems  
7 appropriate.

8  
9 DATED: September 6, 2024

**MANNING & KASS  
ELLROD, RAMIREZ, TRESTER LLP**

10  
11 By: /s/ Mildred K. O'Linn

12 Mildred K. O'Linn, Esq.

13 Lynn L. Carpenter, Esq.

14 Maya R. Sorensen, Esq.

15 Attorneys for Defendants, CITY OF  
16 FRESNO; UNKNOWN LAW  
17 ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS, and  
18 FORMER POLICE CHIEF PACO  
BALDERRAMA

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

MANNING & KASS  
ELLROD, RAMIREZ, TRESTER LLP  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW